

**CONFIDENTIAL**

26 June 1974

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Training  
THROUGH : Chief, Functional Training Division  
SUBJECT : Course Report for the Intelligence Production  
Course #2-74 (18 March - 3 May 1974)

1. The Intelligence Production Course (IPC #2-74) concluded recently on a high note of student interest and enthusiasm. Guest speakers, both internal and external, lauded the Agency's efforts to develop its young professionals in this manner.

In my judgment, the course was successful in all significant respects. As I pointed out to the Chief, CTP, in my over-all evaluation (see attachment), during my ten-year experience in OTR, I have never had a class of Agency professionals as responsive to an educational program as this one. The entire class conducted itself in such exemplary ways that considerable unsolicited praise was generated throughout the entire course.

2. Class Composition

The IPC is designed principally for Career Trainees assigned to production offices of the DDI and the DDS&T. The IPC class met for a seven-week period ending 3 May and consisted of 12 young professionals-- eight career trainees and one officer each from the [REDACTED] and IAS and STATSPEC two from NPIC. Their grades ranged up to GS-11 and the age range was 27-34. More than half the group had less than two year's experience in the Agency. One member had nine years of service, most of it as a Chinese linguist/analyst [REDACTED]. We endeavored to have a qualified STATSPEC reports officer participate in the course. The DDO Training Officer was unable to enroll a candidate this time, but he is interested in principle, and we will hold spaces open for him for the next running.

3. Course Objectives and Methodology

All four key course objectives were met to the degree originally projected. These are expressed in the attached course syllabus.

**CONFIDENTIAL**

**CONFIDENTIAL**

To achieve these objectives, the course was designed with four units of activities:

- a. U. S. Intelligence Objectives and Intelligence Support for Decision-Making (one-half week);
- b. The Intelligence Cycle: Collection and Processing Phase (three weeks);
- c. The Intelligence Cycle: Analysis, Interpretation and Presentation Phases (three and one-half weeks); and
- d. The Consumer of U. S. Foreign Intelligence (one-half week).

The course methodology was adjusted somewhat from previous runnings of the IPC in order to increase opportunities for student participation. Even more changes are contemplated for next time. Methods used included presentations by intelligence specialists and managers from CIA and other selected parts of the Intelligence Community, discussions with intelligence analysts from production offices, participation in practical analytical and communication exercises, and tours of selected facilities within the Intelligence Community.

The emphasis in the activities conducted in the course was such as to allow students to observe research activities in progress, to examine and discuss reports and finished intelligence, to listen to specialists describe their activities--tasking, sources, analytical strategies, reporting formats, and constraints on their daily work--and to participate in a number of practical exercises and special tours.

#### 4. Changes and Innovations

There were a number of significant changes and innovations introduced since the last course:

- I shortened the course from eight to seven weeks. By the September 1974 running we hope to be able to further reduce the schedule to about five weeks or so.
- I introduced several new items for assigned reading including [REDACTED]
- A presentation I gave on the nature and scope of the U. S. Intelligence Community with stress on analytical activities.
- A new presentation on clandestine collection from liaison sources.

25X1A

**CONFIDENTIAL**

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

- A special presentation on the environment of intelligence collection and analysis.
- Opportunity to visit DIA for two special seminars in addition to standard visits to Pentagon and Arlington Hall.
- A visit to Army Security Agency Headquarters (AHS) for the Command Briefing on SIGINT activities in the military. This was enjoyed by the class.
- Introduction of a five-day program on "Methodologies for Intelligence Analysis." This was well done but it presented some problems in course planning which are discussed in para 5.
- Opportunity for the students to attend the CIA Forum in the Auditorium.
- Video-taping of sources survey reports. The first five minutes of the student 15-minute presentations were recorded for subsequent play-back in the session on oral communication guidelines.
- A new program, lasting two days, on the Intercultural and Psychological Dimension of Intelligence Analysis. [REDACTED] did a superb job in a limited time and we plan to repeat this, time permitting.

25X1A

- A new exercise on biographic intelligence was prepared and administered by CRS analysts. The students found this rather difficult in the short time span and we may modify it.

25X1A

- A specially designed analytical exercise covering portions of two days was conducted by [REDACTED] and received good student response.

- A new presentation on the origins of U. S. intelligence by [REDACTED]

25X1A

- New presentations by two NIO's--one an area specialist, one functional.

- A series of case study discussions with various production offices called "The Analyst at Work."

- A new presentation by [REDACTED] of IC Staff on Crisis Management and Indications Intelligence.

25X1A

- A full day on guidelines for oral and written communication of intelligence. This program, conducted by [REDACTED] and

25X1A

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

me included video-taped critiques and a discussion/workshop. Students enjoyed it and said it was very valuable to them.

- Other new presentations included those on intelligence in narcotics control, international terrorism, management of community intelligence resources, and intelligence in a democratic society.
- The big highlight for me, of course, was the DCI taking time to review and comment on student questions. (see attachment)

5. Summary of Student Reactions

The students were given two major opportunities to critique the content and focus of the course--one written evaluation at the end of the first five weeks, the second on the last day. (See attached forms.) In addition, I encouraged daily discussion to adjust the planned activities to meet developing needs and interests to the extent practicable.

A summary of student comments follows:

a. Objectives. Students felt that the aims of the course were achieved. Some felt that more clarification of the process of foreign intelligence support of national decision making would have been desirable. One student stated, "course helped me considerably in understanding the need for the vast intelligence production facilities." Some discussion with students developed the notion that in the area of formulating objectives for the IPC, there may be advantages in exploring the reasons why intelligence production officers are sometimes asked to do work which appears superficially not to be in context with the mission of their offices. Few courses tackle this problem.

b. Scope. The line-up of speakers and tours was "very good." While visits to all of the major DDI production offices got high marks from class members, some felt that OCI coverage was excessive and at the expense of other offices. Presentations by the Offices of Communications and ELINT were not considered so essential. There was surprisingly high interest in NSA. Students agreed on the need to have more time to meet with various desk analysts. We planned for a considerable amount of this analyst-to-analyst dialogue but we apparently need more.

c. Balance. Case studies and briefings concerning the USSR and the PRC dominated, in the students' view. Class members expressed a desire for a stronger focus on such areas as the emerging nations; the challengers, [REDACTED] and the economic entities, such as the Common Market. The sequence of activities and presentations was considered good by virtually all members of the class.

25X1A

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

d. Course Administration. Students were generous in their praise for the way we conducted their course in a "logical, coherent, and effective sequence."

6. Problems Encountered; Plans for the Future

a. The most vexing problem encountered was the extremely short period to get ready for the course--three weeks--combined with a complete loss of the professional staff that had run the previous courses.

As course chairman I determined to "go with success" and eliminate marginal activities as best I could in the short planning period. Accordingly, I had to keep most of the core of the course--tours, student exercises, and key speakers--intact.

The only way this worked at all is that once the course began the students reacted beautifully to our course elements.

b. We lacked a home room for this course because of space limitations in CofC Building. Apparently the students felt this to be a plus factor--it allowed them to move around more than usual. In September I hope to run the course from a single base location if possible.

c. I am convinced that the IPC despite its small size--rarely more than 15 students, needs an additional member of the staff dedicated to the course at all times. We do the students a disfavor, and it is unwise in many ways to try to operate efficiently a course with over 75 elements and more than 60 individuals participating over the seven weeks. It is physically exhausting, looks bad to the outside agencies, and subjects OTR to unfair criticism of inept planning. As it turned out we were lucky to have had only one emergency and that was a metro bus that failed to show as scheduled to return the class from State Department. CIA was not at fault in any way. My recommendation for September is that we have two professional faculty members assigned to the IPC for most of its running.

d. There are a number of changes in course content, scope of presentations, sequence and emphasis which I plan to work on during the next 30-60 days in connection with planning for the September course. Most of these recommendations for change will be outlined in a separate memorandum for review by the DTR and his staffs.

e. There were several problems that arose related to our placing a new segment in the course on Methodologies for Intelligence Analysis.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

We scheduled five days of sessions during the second week and knew that eight of the students had just been through the three-week Functions course. Ordinarily this would have been no problem but duplication of coverage had to be avoided in this case. The ISTP faculty did a creditable job and in my view and that of most students this was a very useful week. Negative criticism centered around the dearth of direct applications to work assignments, the repetition of some materials, too much in such a short time. There was general enjoyment of the [redacted] exercise. In future runnings we will plan to have students attend the Functions Courses only after they have completed the IWA and IPC courses.

25X1A

f. In summary, one thing seems very clear. The IPC as it has been conducted in recent years is a highly respected course for young analysts. If we are careful to perceive its strong elements, add certain new ones along the lines of current proposals, and adjust the sequence of courses closely related to it, the IPC remains a prime candidate as the foundation course in the structure of training and developing analysts at the basic level.

25X1A

  
Course Chairman

## Attachments:

- A. Course Syllabus
- B. Course Schedule
- C. Evaluation of CT Participants (memo for CTP)
- D. Student Roster
- E. Student Profile Forms
- F. Class Roster and Profiles
- G. Sources Survey (Instructors)
- H. Sources Survey (Questionnaire)
- I. Field Office Interview List
- J. Student Critique Forms (A&B)
- K. Guidelines for Research Project
- L. List of Questions for DCI
- M. Student Critiques

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~





A